

V. Remarks on the Genera of *Pæderota*, *Wulfenia*, and *Hemimeris*. By  
James Edward Smith, M. D. F. R. S. P. L. S.

Read October 7, 1800.

THE genus of *Pæderota* was first constituted by Linnæus in his Academical Dissertation entitled *Plantæ rariores Africanæ*, published at Upsal in 1760, and reprinted in the 6th volume of the *Amœnitates Academicæ* in 1763. In the former edition the genus was called *Hemimeris*, in the latter *Pæderota*, and the only species there mentioned bears the trivial name of *bonæ spei*. This plant has never been well known to botanists in general. The original specimen probably remained in Professor Burmann's hands, along with the other plants described in the above-mentioned dissertation; but Linnæus, I know not at what period, obtained another, which is preserved in his herbarium with the name of *b. spei* in his own hand, and which he afterwards described in the *Supplementum* as *Hemimeris diffusa*. Unfortunately he neglected to quote *Pæderota bonæ spei* as a synonym in that work, and his son, with all the materials before him, totally overlooked it; so that Professor Murray, and other compilers, give us the same plant under both names. Even M. De Jussieu seems not to have known this original species of *Pæderota*. His ideas of the genus are taken from the *Buonarotta* of Micheli, and the *Pæderota lutea* of Scopoli, the former of which is referred to *Pæderota* by Linnæus in the 2d edition of *Sp. Plant.* by the name of *P. Buonarota*, and the latter is called in his 2d *Mantissa*, *P. Ageria*. These plants appear again in the *Supplementum*, with new and improved specific characters, under the names of *P. cœrulea* and *P. lutea*, and their

old denominations not being there quoted, each of them occurs twice in Murray's and Gmelin's editions of the *Systema*; but such repetitions are too frequent in both those writers to excite our wonder at present. M. De Jussieu observes, very justly in my opinion, that the *Wulfenia* of Jacquin agrees in genus with these last-mentioned plants. This being the case, and as they by no means agree with the original *Paderota*, it would be best to range them under that of *Wulfenia*, a name which has every possible claim to be retained. *Paderota* may very well be spared. The plant which first bore that name was *previously* called *Hemimeris*, as I have already observed, and is now so denominated in the *Supplementum*, along with two others that accord with it in genus. If the name *Wulfenia* should be refused to the plants to which I would apply it, they must be called *Buonarotta*, merely on account of priority; for I know of no other claim to such an honour in the Florentine senator after whom Micheli named them.

The generic characters of *Wulfenia* and *Hemimeris* may be expressed as follows:

#### WULFENIA.

*Diandria Monogynia*, next to *Veronica*.

*Corolla* tubulosa, ringens. *Calyx* quinquepartitus. *Capsula* bilocularis, quadrivalvis.

The species are,

1. *W. Buonarotta*, caule folioso, corollæ labio superiore indiviso.
2. *W. Ageria*, caule folioso, corollæ labio superiore emarginato.
3. *W. carinthiaca*, caule nudo, foliis crenatis.

#### HEMIMERIS.

*Didynamia Angiospermia*, next to *Antirrhinum*.

*Calyx* quinquepartitus. *Corolla* rotata, resupinata, basi gibbosa, hinc fissa. *Filamenta* glabra. *Capsula* bilocularis.

The

The only species I have hitherto ascertained are the following :

1. *H. sabulosa* diandra, foliis oppositis pinnatifidis, caule prostrato.
2. *H. diffusa*, didynama, foliis alternis oppositifque pinnatifidis, caule patulo.
3. *H. montana*, diandra, foliis ovatis ferratis obtusiusculis, caule erecto.
4. *H. urticifolia*, didynama, foliis ovatis ferratis acutis, caule suffruticoso, capsulis retusis.

*Celsia urticifolia*. *Curt. Mag. t. 417.*

5. *H. linearis*, didynama, foliis lineari-lanceolatis subserratis, caule suffruticoso, capsulis acutis.

*Celsia linearis*. *Jacq. Ic. rar. v. 3. t. 497. Curt. Mag. t. 210.*

The three first I know only from specimens in the Linnæan herbarium. The *diffusa* is suspected by the younger Linnæus to be a variety of the *sabulosa*, to which I can scarcely assent. It is not easy to say which of the two may be the original *Pæderota bonæ spei*. The specimen of Linnæus so marked is the *diffusa*; but he had not that before him when he wrote the dissertation upon rare African plants, and it has certainly four stamina. If the number of stamina be constant, the *sabulosa* (which has but two) must have been the real *Pæderota*. The *montana* is sufficiently distinct in habit and character from both.

The two remaining species are natives of Peru, and have for some time been commonly known in our gardens as species of *Celsia*, but certainly without foundation. The error originated with Professor Ortega, and he has been followed by Jacquin and Curtis against their own judgment, for neither of these plants has the habit or character of any *Celsia*. It is to be lamented that such erroneous names should be ignorantly given and heedlessly retained, as it is difficult to eradicate them when once applied to any very popular and ornamental plant. Thus a most beautiful *Chelone* has been

lately brought from Spain by the specific name of *ruelloides*, and it is so called amongst us: but a more preposterous blunder was hardly ever made in botany, as those who know the plant, and can read Linnæus's *Supplementum*, p. 279, will readily perceive. With respect to the two species of *Hemimeris* in question, they perfectly accord with the generic character given above, with which also the Linnæan *sabulosa* and *diffusa*, (which I have carefully macerated and dissected), and to all appearance the *montana* also, perfectly agree. In their general habit and structure they also manifestly form altogether one natural genus.